insulted him in a public place. As Shri Prabhakar Reddy was not prepared to go to the hospital, the Sub Inspector instructed Shri Prabhakar Reddy to give a written complaint to enable him to start the proceedings. No written complaint was given. Shri Ayub Khan was secured in the evening at 7 P.M. and the matter was enquired into. Shri Ayub Khan denied having slapped Shri Reddy but admitted that there was an exchange of hot words between himself and Shri Reddy and gave the particulars relating to the dues, etc.

On the morning of 9th September 1968 the students of the Polytechnic and the Municipal First Grade College, numbering about 500 marched towards the house of Shri Ayub Khan, shouting slogans like "Down with Ayub Khan, etc.". It is alleged that they demanded a public apology and compensation from Shri Ayub Khan and started pelting stones at his house, cut the telephone wires and attempted to trespass into the House.

The Police rushed to the place with a view to restoring order. It is reported that the students resented the arrival of police and started pelting stones at them also. As a result P.C. 391 Sarvothama Rao and 297 Sheik Akbar sustained injuries. In the meanwhile, some of the students started climbing the tiled roof of Shri Ayub Khan and removing the tiles. The Municipal President, some Municipal Councillors and other gentlemen of the town and the Sub-Inspector tried to intervene and pacify the students. But they refused to heed to the advice and the situation was getting out of control. Therefore, in self-defence and in the defence of public property the police were obliged to disperse the mob by a mild lathi charge. As a result of the charge, one Shri Rajanna sustained a superficial injury and got himself treatad as an out-patient in the Combined Hospital, Chintamani. Similarly the injured P.Cs. were also treated at the Combine d Hospital, Chintamani.

In this connection a case in Chintamani Town PS Crime No. 40/68 u/s 143, 147, 148, 149, 21, 427 and 109 IPC has been registered and the investigation is in progress.

The situation in Chintamani is reported to be now completely under control. Students are attending their classes regularly. Further developments are under close watch.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—Sir, I have given notice of a privilege motion and it may be taken into consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It has just come before me and I shall refer to it after the recess.

NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT MOTION BY SRIYUTS T. R. SHAMANNA AND OTHERS

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have promised to this hon'ble House that I would give my ruling regarding the adjournment motion tabled by the hon'ble Members Sri T. R. Shamanna, Sri M. S. Krishnan, Sri Vatal Nagaraj and Sri P. Thimmiah.

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—The Chair had promised that the Hon'ble Minister would make a statement before the ruling is given.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I shall request the Hon'ble Minister to make a statement if he wants.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—My privilege motion also touches the same question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Both are separate matters.

ಶ್ರೀ ವಾಟಾಳ್ ನಾಗರಾಜ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಶೆಟ್ಟರ್ ಅವರು ಏನು ಪ್ರಿವಿಲೇಜ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಅದು ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಹೇಳದೆ ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯುವ ಮುಂಚೆಯೇ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—On Saturday the Hon'ble Minister could have made a statement regarding holding of elections to the Bangalore Corporation in the House itself. He did not do that but he went to Mysore for a function and made a statement about holding elections. He is not prepared to disclose any such matters to this House but he is prepared to disclose it outside. Is it not breach of privilege of this House?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble Member is a leader of a group and as such should he not be more amenable to discipline of the House? This matter has come before me only now; I shall go into it.

Sri S. S. SHETTAR.—I have given it long ago at 12 O'Clock.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As I said, I shall apply my mind and give the ruling after the recess.

If the Hon'ble Minister for Labour wants to say anything on the adjournment motion, he may do so.

Sri T. R. SHAMANNA.—My only request is that let the Minister give a favourable reply.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I cannot give direction to the Minister to make a particular statement offhand.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಜುನಾಯಿತ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನನ್ನು ರದ್ದುಮಾಡಿ 1970 ನೇ ಮೇ ತಿಂಗಳವರೆಗೆ ಆಡಳಿತ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿದೆ. ಕೆಲವು ನಾಗರೀಕರು ಈ ಆಜ್ಞೆಯ ಕ್ರಮಬದ್ಧತೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶ್ನಿಸಿ ಶ್ರೇಷ್ಠ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ರಿಟ್ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆ ಹೂಡಿದ್ದರು. ಶ್ರೇಷ್ಠ ನ್ಯಾಯಾಲಯವು ಈ ಆಡಳಿತ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯು ನೇತೃತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಆಡಳಿತ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ, ಆಡಳಿತ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯ ಅವಧಿಯನ್ನು ಮೊಟಕುಮಾಡಿ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಜುನಾಯಿತಿಯನ್ನು ತ್ವರಿತವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೆಲವು ನಿರ್ದೇಶನಗಳನ್ನು ಸೂಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಆರ್. ಶಾಮಣ್ಣ.—ಆಡಳಿತ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಆಡಳಿತ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ * * * *

Sri D. B. KALMANKAR (Aland).—Sir, I have given notice of a Motion.

Mr. SPEAKER,—I am just giving a Ruling now.

---

* * * Matter not recorded as ordered by the Chair.

Sri D. B. KALMANKAR.—It is a Motion to the effect that the hon'ble Minister Sri K. Puttaswmy had made a disclosure of information on the occasion of commissioning of the Filter Plant at Hosahalli near Krishnarajasagara on 15th September 1968 that a Bill seeking to convert the Mysore Municipality into a Corporation will be introduced, thereby he has disclosed policy matters. I think it is a breach of parliamentary convention, and the parliamentary convention requires that when the Assembly is in Session, policy matters should not be disclosed outside, because it amounts to breach of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Perhaps the hon'ble Member was inattentive when I informed Sri Shettar about it. Sri Shettar has given a Notice and it is before me. I said that I would consider it and give my Ruling after the recess. I know hon'ble Member Sri Kalmankar is a very senior lawyer. We are bound by rules here. Hon'ble member should make it a point not to rise without Chair's permission.

Sri D. B. KALMANKAR.—Sir, I have given a Notice.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It has not reached me yet.

RULING OF THE SPEAKER *re:* NOTICE OF ADJOURNMENT MOTION BY SRI T. R. SHAMANNA AND OTHERS.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Four hon'ble Members Sriyuths T. R. Shamanna, M. S. Krishnan, Vatal Nagaraj and P. Thimmaiah have given a Notice of an Adjourument Motion under Rule 50, wherein for reasons 1 to 11 they want the elections to Bangalore City Corporation to be held early and a discussion should be permitted in the House. I am bound by the Rules and the hon'ble Members, of course, have got to be satisfied that the Ruling is based on the Rules adopted by this House. Under Rule 50, if a matter is to be taken up for discussion, it must be of urgent public importance. The restrictions on the right to make a Motion of this nature are contained in Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure. Sub-rule (i) of Rule 52 state that not more than one such motion shall be made At the same sitting. This condition is satisfied and there is no difficulty. Sub-rule (ii) says that not more than one matter shall be discussed on the same motion.

The hon'ble members who have moved the Motion to raise the question of elections to the Bangalore City Corporation, have as many as eleven grounds. Though they have tried to put all these 11 grounds in support of one Motion, in effect they come to nearly 11 Adjournment Motions. Eleven separate grounds have been mentioned. The scope of this Motion cannot be fulfilled in two hours or so if all these 11 matters are to be considered. So, I think, there is a bar on taking this Motion under sub-rule (ii) of Rule 52 of the Rules of Procedure.

Sub-rule (iii) of Rule 52 states that a motion shall be restricted to a specific matter of recent occurrence. This is a matter which has taken